

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
§
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

GREGORY K. ADAMSON,

Case No. 2:11-cv-00781-MMD-CWH

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

AMATI, et al.,

Defendants.

The Court issued an Order addressing a number of consolidated motions pending at the time, including motion for extension of time, motion for competency evaluation, motion to change judge and motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. no. 64.) Plaintiff promptly filed a consolidated motion objecting to the Order, requesting an extension of time to file a more thorough objection and renewed requests to change judge and for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. nos. 67, 68, 69, 70.) Defendant filed a response (dkt. no. 73) and Plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to file his reply and a motion to offer additions to his earlier motion (dkt. no. 74, 75.) Plaintiff has continued his practice of seeking extensions of time instead of addressing the underlying claims. (See dkt. no. 64.)

Plaintiff offers no valid reason for the Court to reconsider. Mere disagreement with an order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration. Nor should reconsideration be used to make new arguments or ask the Court to rethink its analysis. See *N.W. Acceptance Corp. v. Lynnwood Equip., Inc.*, 841 F.2d 918, 925-26 (9th Cir. 1988). The Court therefore declines to reconsider its Order.

1 It is therefore ordered that the following motions are denied: motion to reconsider
2 (dkt. no. 67); motion to extend time (dkt. no. 68); renewed motion for recusal (dkt. no.
3 69); renewed motion for change of judge (dkt. no. 70); renewed motion for appointment
4 of counsel (dkt. no. 71); motion to extend time (dkt. no. 74); motion for additions to
5 motion (dkt. no. 75). Any future motions raising similar issues that the Court has
6 considered will be summarily denied.

7 DATED THIS 2nd day of March 2016.

8
9 

10 MIRANDA M. DU
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28